DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 235 512 CS 504 284

AUTHOR McAnany, Emile G.
TITLE Development Ethics and Funding Communications Projects: Some Critical Reflections.
PUB DATE May 83
NOTE 24p.; Paper prepared for the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association (Dallas, TX, May 26-30, 1983).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Communication Problems; *Communication Research; *Communications; *Developing Nations; Environmental Influences; *Ethics; Futures (of Society); Intellectual History; Literature Reviews; *Mass Media; Moral Values; Research Design; Researchers; Research Needs; Social Change; *Technological Advancement; Theories
IDENTIFIERS Developmental Communication

ABSTRACT

To evaluate the ethical role of researchers in developmental communication, this paper first reviews current thinking on development theories, suggesting that world recession, as well as skyrocketing national debts and internal conflicts in Third World nations underscore (1) the relationship between Third World development and global stability, (2) the distinction between development and Westernization, and (3) the existence of internal as well as external obstacles to national development. It then describes three positive developments in communication thinking over the past decade: a more modest view of communication as reflection rather than the cause of social structures and values, a greater understanding of the complex interaction between the media and society, and a new recognition that not all Third World problems can be solved through technological advancements. Summarizing current findings on social change, the paper suggests, for example, that change cannot be carried out simply by political mandate. In conclusion, the paper discusses researchers' need to critically evaluate their work. Communication scientists, it suggests, must review both the ends of their projects and the means, and then work to direct the reduced funding to those projects having the greatest impact on human needs. (MM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED235512

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Emile G. McAnany

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Development Ethics And Funding Communications Projects:

Some Critical Reflections

MAY 1983

Emile G. McAnany
Radio-Television-Film Department
College Of Communication
University Of Texas At Austin
Austin, Texas 78712

Paper Prepared For The International Communication Association

Conference, Dallas, Texas

CS 504281

"The moral law is the cement of every just and mutually beneficial relationship among people. The happiness and welfare of humanity will be [achieved] always in direct relationship to the degree of efficacy to which the precepts of this law are preserved and acted upon. From it depend the very existence of the rights, material well-being and honor among human beings. It prescribes the behavior of one person towards another, one group towards others groups, one nation towards other nations. It is the unwritten law of the spirit, the Golden Rule. It influences our lives more than all written documents, more than all decrees and norms that people have developed until now and will be able to create to the end of time.

"It is the universal law, absolute and eternal. It is engraved in our consciences from the beginning of time...It is the immovable foundation of all useful and just written law."

> Concluding page, The Ethics of the National Guard, by Lt. Col. Jose Maria Lemus, San Salvador (Spanish publication from the Sec. of Information, 1949)

"I wish to make a special appeal to the men of the army and in particular to the rank and file of the National Guard, of the police and of the garrison. Brothers, you are from among the same people, you kill your very brother peasants. Above an order to kill given by a man, the Law of God must prevail, which says 'Thou shall not kill.'

"No solider is required to obey an order against the Law of God. Now it is time to recover your conscience and to obey your conscience. No one must obey an immoral command . . .In the name of God and in the name of suffering people . . . I beseech you, I beg you, I order you, in the name of God: Stop the repression."

> Concluding remarks of the Sunday homily of Oscar Romero, Archbishop of San Salvador, March 23, 1980, the day before his assassination.

Introductory Remarks

The juxtaposition of the two quotes above is not meant to emphasize the irony that is surely there, but rather to illustrate that morality and ethics are very much a part of both politics and development. This paper will attempt to sort out for the constituency of communication researchers some of the moral and ethical problems facing us in our work in development and social change. Briefly, morality in this context is understood as the system of values by which we discern principles of right and wrong to guide our behavior. Ethics involves the framework of reasoning by which we judge the means we take to achieve the ends we have decided to follow. Finally, and this returns us to our quotations with which we began, personal commitment to principles of moral behavior is that which distinguishes between ethical rhetoric and moral action. In a sense, Archbishop Romero showed what morality was in practice while the National Guard textbook indicated what it was in theory.

To begin our discussion about the ethics of development funding with the case of El Salvador may seem provocative. The current debate in the U.S. Congress over whether to spend 65, 72 or 126 million dollars in El Salvador in 1984 would seem to evoke partisan political debate and have little to do with an ethical discussion about funding communication projects. I would like to remind my audience that the case of El Salvador may, indeed, be a good place to start because it was there some fifteen years ago that a major project was funded to harness communication for the purposes of development.

There is a personal thread to all of this that I would like to unravel before proceeding with the body of the presentation. In April, 1968 I landed for the first time at the Ilopango Airport in San Salvador to meet a group working on a local educational television project. I was on a trip through Latin America to interview people from development communication projects; the trip was sponsored by a contract that Stanford University had with SRI and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). I did not know it at the time, but I would return in August of that year to take up residence in El Salvador for 18 months to do research on this same television project under the sponsorship of USAID. A number of close colleagues at Stanford shared this experience with me as the research and the project (also partly sponsored by USAID) stretched out for four years in El Salvador and several more back in Palo Alto. We worked closely with many Salvadoran colleagues and achieved what we considered was a useful and worthwhile scholarly and practical outcome in the publication of our research--to be shared, we hoped, by others in the Third World.[1]

I left the country at the end of 1969 but returned a number of times thereafter to work with colleagues in 1970 and 1971. It became apparent to me through this experience in El Salvador that the ethical dilemmas of development and social change were almost a textbook case in this project and I was to have this confirmed through a chance encounter I had in 1972, toward the close of our project. Walter Beneke was a dynamic minister of education during the years we worked on the project in El Salvador. He was responsible for introducing a major educational reform and the educational television project. Several years after my own departure from El Salvador, I met Beneke by chance in the lobby of a hotel in West Africa. He was by then the foreign minister of his country and was in Africa to negotiate

with other coffee producing countries world price supports. It was late 1972 and, as it happened, recent elections in El Salvador had given the Christian Democratic candidate, Napoleon Duarte, the presidency. The day we met I had just heard on the radio that the military (with the help of the National Guard) had overthrown Duarte and denied the elections. Beneke was worried and uncertain as to what would happen to the country. The next day, again by chance, I ended up in a seat next to Beneke on on eight hour flight to New York. We spent the time talking about the future of El Salvador and Central America. He said that change was certainly coming in the region but how it would come would be a question of whether the oligarchy would recognize the need for the liberal reforms that Duarte and his vice president, Guillermo Ungo, stood for, or whether these changes would be forced by violent repression and civil war. I left Beneke at the airport in New York and never saw him again. He was assassinated by unidentified gunmen in 1979. As it turned out, the more pessimistic scenario that I had heard on the plane was destined to be played out in El Salvador from 1972 until now. Like many others, I ask myself the question of why the obvious and "rational" course of change and development was not followed out by the government and outside funding agencies and why only a bloodbath would persuade those external agencies toward the reforms that had been promised in 1972.

Looking back fifteen years after my first contact with El Salvador, there are a number of personal as well as policy questions that I feel I need to raise. I begin with the basic question—first to myself then to

other communication scholars--about values and effectiveness of communication projects: was the effort of our project in El Salvador worthwhile? What has been the consequence of similar development efforts sponsored by development agencies during the last fifteen years? What role does or can communication play in the reversal of historic structures that seem only to change under the pressure of political and even military force? And finally, what does ethical analysis provide to the communication scholar to guide choices and help to create genuine change?

Admittedly, there are no simple answers to these troubling questions. The development literature is strewn with failures, whether these be of development projects themselves or the failed paradigms of scholars--and enough has been written of this type of agonized analysis by both theorists and practioners. I am departing in this paper from the usual norms of social science and looking at the norms of development ethics for some enlightenment. Unlike the usual assumption of "objectivity" in social science, the arena of moral discussion frankly admits to the importance of value positions. Nevertheless, even if one's own values are a starting point in an ethical discussion, they are not meant to impose one's subjective impressions on the reality of development and change, but be a beginning of a search for a value framework that might be shared by others. The remainder of this paper will attempt to draw out the implications of the questions I have raised. I will first review where I think we have come from over the past decades in answering the effectiveness questions in development communication in sections one through three. In section four I will address the question of values and ethical choices concerning funding of development communication projects.

1. Development Theories: What Have We Learned?

Today we seem to be at a low point over the past three decades regarding development theories. We are poised between cycles, as it were, and theories about change in the Third World are uncertain about direction. From the early 1950's for about two decades, we seemed to have solved the development puzzle with economic theories of capital formation and import substitution, social theories of modernization and diffusion of innovations and practical approaches of central planning and social engineering. From the early 1970's and especially after 1974 with the rise of OPEC, the pendulum swung toward a more critical view of development. Dependency and structuralist theories became dominant and the Third World began to talk seriously of a New International Economic Order (NIEO). Today, a decade later, with world recession and massive foreign debt in many Third World countries and the weakening of OPEC itself, much of the optimism about massive financial and technological transfers from North to South has faded.

It may be a good time to reassess briefly the experience of these past two cycles in order to get a better bearing on where we might be headed next. This may be done by summarizing briefly what we have learned in the past three decades about development. We will do so in three propositions:

a. Development is not a problem of the Third World but of all of us.

A group of professionals at the World Bank has been meeting privately for about four years now to discuss value and ethical questions in their own development work.[2] During this time they concluded that the major problems facing the world today were not problems of the Third World but of everyone because the world today is a single interconnected system with economic, communication, political and cultural manifestations. A list of common

world-wide problems would include: (1) a threat of nuclear destruction; (2) the injustice in the distribution of wealth (the growing gaps between rich and poor countries and rich and poor groups within countries); (3) environmental degradation; (4) malfunction of the world economic system through inflation and recession. The solutions, they conclude, are not those that aim at either the Third or the First Worlds but for everyone. Also, in this discussion they place their analysis within the context of ethical and religious values and not within the technical economic framework usual for the World Bank. This discussion illustrates conclusions that many people concerned about development have arrived at: that problems are global, that we are living in a single world system where solutions are interdependent, and that political and economic forces reach across national boundaries. Our actions, therefore, whether directed outward internationally or not may have international implications.

b. Development is not westernization, GNP growth nor modernization.

The recent resurgence of traditional forces of religion and culture in the Islamic world and in Latin America[3] remind us that the rational world of modernization (or Westernization) presented by Lerner or Inkles failed to take into account the resistance and resilience of traditional values in a changing world.[4] Japan is often referred to these days as a model for the future of the First World, but we often forget that despite its rapid industrial advance, Japan remains a country with strong ties to its traditional values.

The NIEO debate has placed an emphasis on transfers of capital and technology to the Third World, but another approach of Basic Human Needs (BHN) has also been popular during the same period. This latter approach places

emphasis on the fundamental right of all people to housing, food, health care, education, and gainful employment. Some have added two other needs related to values: personal dignity and their own cultural values for the world's poor majorities. BHN and NIEO have often been opposed to each other for various political and ideological reasons: NIEO advocates fear that BHN is a ploy of the industrialized West to get poor nations to be more self-reliant and to let them off the hook of supplying more advanced technology to the Third World; BHN advocates see NIEO goals as satisfying local elites and, further, being a technocratic response to human needs that go beyond the material needs of people. But this opposition is unfortunate because the two positions are pursuing the same goals in many senses and should admit both the importance of growth but with distribution.

c. Development suffers from internal as well as external obstacles.

If the wisdom of the first cycle of development theory suffered from the syndrome of victim blame, seeing the Third World as passive and traditional and in need of "catching up," the second cycle in the 1970's perhaps suffered from the opposite which was an overemphasis on the imperialism thesis. Dependency theory, so popular among many development theorists, especially in Latin America,[5] should not, when correctly understood, neglect the internal obstacles to change.[6] There are structural barriers within Third World countries that are related to rigid class interests (as in El Salvador), but also to ethnic rivalries, bureaucracy and the passivity created by oppression that Fanon and Freire have described so well.[7] The next generation of development theory and practice will need to take into account both external and internal obstacles to development.

2. Communication in Development: Optimism and Pessimism

The history of development thinking over the past decades is mirrored somewhat closely in the explanations that communication scholars have given for communications' role in development. From the early enthusiasm of Lerner, Schramm and Rogers and others about the role of the mass media in contributing to the development of the Third World, there have been a series of revisions during the 1970's.[8,9] Yet riding on the crest of OPEC and NIEO was a similar movement toward a new optimism expressed by members of the MacBride Commission report who endorsed the transfer of communications to the Third World so that these countries could take their places in the new information society.[10] Today there is perhaps a new sense of pessimism among international scholars due to the current world recession and the minimal support for such transfers of technology as UNESCO's new International Program of Development Communication (IPDC) advocates.[11]

We might look at three developments in communication thinking over the past decade that will help us to understand the future directions communication in development might take.

a. Mass communication can be a tool, not a cause of change.

As the complexity of development and social change became increasingly apparent in the 1970's, the more modest role of mass communications in development became equally apparent.[12] This more modest role followed with a certain time-lag the view of the mass communication scholars in the industrialized countries who saw communications not as a direct cause but more a reflection of societal structures and values. The role of communication as summarized by Hornik as a "complement to development" placed emphasis on those political and situational factors that are open to human choice within a set

of structural constraints.[13] As a consequence of this analysis some may have interpreted this theoretical rethinking as prompting a kind of paralysing pessimism in reaction to the former optimism. Such is not the case. What has emerged is a more realistic view based on field research of what communication can be expected to do within a set of local constraints. If we have tended to focus on constraints over the recent past, it is not to give up mass communication as a tool for change but to work on overcoming those constraints to the degree possible.

b. Mass communication is both an institution and cultural value system.

At the same time that many scholars were qualifying their estimates of what mass communication could do to promote development goals, others under the thrust of the NIEO and its companion movement, the New International Information Order (NIIO), seemed to be saying that mass communication was a tool for legitimizing the international and local status quo and promoting cultural changes reflecting the values of First World, capitalist, consumer society and not authentic development values.[14] Although the analysis of imposed cultural values, and the one-way flow of television programs and other cultural products seem to have come to a momentary pause, its consequences for research in the U.S. are a growing awareness of both the institutional aspects of the media (including the economic aspect of the international communication marketing and distribution system) as well as important cultural aspects of the media. There is an increased awareness of the importance of cultural studies approaches[15] to news content of broadcasting as well as the entertainment texts analyzed. The consequences of these influences on the conception of uses for communication in development would seem to be a better recognition of the complex way in which media and society interact. It is no longer

acceptable in either First or Third Worlds to look only at the effects of communications on individuals, but cultural, institutional and economic considerations are to be examined within the specific contexts of each country in order to assess the potential for development communication projects.

c. Is new technology the path to the good society?

One of the contradictory themes sounded in the MacBride Commission Report, Many Voices, One World (1980), was an ambivalence about new communication and information technologies.[16] On the one hand,the authors of the report seemed convinced that Third World countries would benefit from the rapid deployment of new technologies (from video cassettes to direct broadcast satellites) in order not to fall further behind in the race toward the information society. On the other hand, they hinted that the control and development of this technology will be part of the trade strategy of a few industrialized countries to keep them ahead of all others. The advocacy of the development of national communication policies to better control national communication resources, also strongly advocated by the MacBride report, provided little concrete guidance in this matter. If a few countries, like Brazil,[17] have succeeded in outlining policies that provide detailed limits to transnational interests in telecommunications, most Third World countries have little foreseeable stake in the information society except as consumers. A number of authors have begun to point out the limits to the benefits of new technologies to Third World peoples everywhere (even, perhaps, in Silicon Valley!).[18]

3. Social Change: Lessons from the Third World.

If theories of development are generated by the academic elite of such disciplines as economics, sociology, anthropology and communications, the other, more pragmatic views from Third World leaders have been couched more in the political terms of social change strategies. There are, indeed, theories of social change based on historical cases[19] that have a more abstract quality

to them, but the last decade has sharpened the differences of views concerning how genuine change in society is to be achieved. The current debate, for example, about Central America may not be over whether the conflict is one of East vs. West but over whether a conflict model of change better explains historic shifts than does a reform model. A brief examination is called for at this point into what we have learned from the study of social change over the last several decades and what it might contribute to our study of the ethics of communication in development. As we have done above, we summarize in the form of several propositions:

a. Social change means more than a change of political power.

The overwhelming evidence concerning social change is that it cannot be achieved by a mere shift in who controls political power. When Allende and the Peruvian generals took political power in the 1970's, both made significant efforts to change some of the fundamental relationships on which their respective societies had been based. Neither succeeded in achieving those basic changes for a variety of very different reasons, but both cases illustrate that political power is a necessary but not sufficient condition in social change. Other more successful cases of social change can be studied historically. The Peoples Republic of China is a favorite case to examine, but Japan is sometimes also noted as a case of non-conflictual change. Regarding many of the areas of the Third World, whether the Middle East, Southern Africa or Central America, the conflict model of change seems to fit historical circumstances better. Perhaps this is because the entrenched power group refuses to believe in the seriousness of the situation, but many cases show an unwillingness to concede even mild liberal reforms in the face of recognized need. There are non-Marxist explanations of this conflict model of change,[20] but many of the Marxist explanations fit the historical circum-

stances without necessarily meaning that the conflict was generated by Marxists.

b. Social change models can incorporate traditional values.

The overthrow of the Shah of Iran alerted the world to the dynamism of religious and cultural forces in social change. Far from being the dying tradition in the Middle East as Lerner had asserted in 1958, Islam in the late 1970's had helped to generate radical, non-Marxist change in what seemed to be the archtype of a modernizing society.[20] The role of the Catholic Church's Liberation Theology in several countries of Latin America may account in part for the direction and shape of change in Central America and even in the Philippines.[22] This does not necessarily mean a move back historically to outdated models (although in the case of Iran some think that it might). Nor does it mean that the incorporation of some Marxist analytical tools in the methods of Liberation Theology means that Christianity has become Marxist and therefore not Christian (although some conservative critics have asserted this). The cultural integrity of Moslems and a variety of other Third World majorities has entered the struggle for political power and social change. The presence of American cultural products in the form of film and television programs or media advertising have themselves been the occasion of organized resistance by religious groups who see the content of American media as a manifestation of materialism and imperial power.

c. Grass roots growth from small to larger units of society.

The alternatives to major social change may be the growth of small grass roots groups working toward their own forms of control at a local level. The feasibility of bottom-up, gradual change is questioned among those who see the necessity of national social change, but others disagree. Esteva, for example, sees the possibility of change in rural areas through the mobilization of a transformed and modernized peasantry in rural Mexico.[23]

De Janvry's analysis of agrarian reforms in Latin America seems, however, to hold more for national political coalitions.[24] The role of the Christian Base Communities (or comunidades de base, a form of organized, community churches, usually without a priest where lay people carry out worship, cathecisis and other religious activities) in El Salvador and Nicaragua, as well as the nearly 80,000 that exist among the poor of Brazil's Catholic faith, is significant for grass roots organizing and political action as well as for religious activities.[25]

The growth of smaller grass roots organizations into larger coalitions that can exert political pressure for change beyond the local level will depend, among other things, on an underlying set of common values among different grass roots organizations, whether these be ethnic, cultural, religious or political. The Sarvodaya movement in Sri Lanka which combines religious and ethical values of Buddhism with self-reliant forms of development has grown to over a million strong.[26] The problem, as Denis Goulet points out about the movement, is how to enter the national level of social change without being co-opted by government bureaucrats or political elites.

4. The Ethics of Development Funding: Values and Personal Commitments

We began our paper with several quotations about ethics, morality and personal commitment. At this point we return to the major theme of the paper: what role does ethics have in the thinking and behavior of communication scholars. Denis Goulet has said of development ethics that it is:

> A kind of praxis which generates critical reflection on the values of content and meaning of one's social action. Unlike mere extrinsic treatment of means, ethical praxis conditions choices and priorities by assigning relative value allegiances to essential needs, basic power relationships, and criteria for determining tolerable levels of human suffering in promoting social change.[27]

A brief look at this definition will reveal some practical conclusions from our previous review of research experience in development theories, role of communication in development and theories of social change.

First Goulet calls ethical thinking about development "critical reflection on the value of content and meaning of one's social action." This calls for communication scholars to reflect critically on what we have been doing in our work. By reviewing critically the research of the last twenty years, we are asking ourselves the important scientific and policy questions about the efficacy of our theories and the consequences in their translation into practice. Has any development paradigm worked: If not, why? What can be done to substitute more reasonable strategies of research and action for them? But in addition to this professional reflection, there is the moral question behind the scientific statements about the "problem" of poverty, illiteracy and hunger of Third World majorities. The moral dimension is stated as "injustice." In addition, the moral dimension speaks to us individually as to how the meaning of one's own actions are related to the larger problem of injustice, and this calls for reflection on how well the means we have used achieved the goal of changing the situation of underdevelopment.

Second, Goulet points out that values come into the assessment of efficacy. Not only does one need to ask the question about whether projects help solve concrete problems of lived injustice, but one needs to ask about value implications of the means to achieve development goals. Goulet outlines these as: essential needs, power relations and criteria for human suffering in accomplishing social change. Perhaps an illustration will make the point clear. One kind of development model emphasizes the impact of increased GNP regardless of how it is distributed, the assumption being that increased

income at certain social levels will trickle down to other levels automatically. The fallacy of such an assumption undelines the increased disparity of income distribution in many middle or low income countries. There are contradictory choices between different needs that are defined as "essential" by different social groups: whether these be in favor of arms over basic health care, high technology over primary education etc. It is true that we as researchers do not have any control over decisions made by bureaucrats in our own or in other governments, but we need to, as Goulet points out, reflect on our own value positions in our work. We can and do reflect on the consequences of development means to purported ends and the often unintended effects embodied in value words like "equity," "local control" and "social costs." It is a personal reflection on own's own actions, but it is based upon the evidence of concrete experience and research about impacts of projects on people. Ultimately, however, it is a personal guide to action, and here development ethics, if taken seriously, should affect not only what we write or teach about, but also how we direct our personal research and consulting activity. The criteria are not only objective to judge development activities by but suggest how we relate to those activities.

A final and more complex problem that was part of the task of this particular paper concerns the question of funding development communication projects. Again there are certain ethical considerations that are objective and others that force us to a more personal reflection on value issues. Among the former, I would like to start with a reminder of the four world problems mentioned above. The first was the threat of nuclear destruction and the second the unjust situation of massive poverty in the Third World. The two are not unrelated in a way. In 1980 all types of foreign economic assistance worldwide was $36 billion while expenditures on armaments was $550 billion.[28] This contradiction in world priorities is an objectively immoral situation in

which each of us is in some way implicated. A further problem is that the declining percentage of per capita income given by most First World countries to international development aid comes at a time when inflation and recession have hit the poorest 33 countries the hardest. The recession in the U.S. has accompanied an explicit domestic policy of the Reagan administration to cut back on taxes and the role of the federal government in the provision of services. This would seem to be a good time, then, for the private voluntary organizations (PVO's) to do better in their important international work. Yet at present, PVO's like Caritas and Catholic Relief Services are not only suffering reductions in their own private sources (because of increased competition of hard hit domestic agencies) but are getting less from the government and even the amount they receive is being tied more closely with foreign policy considerations that PVO's find unacceptable (New York Times, February 13, 1983, p. A7).

Added to these more distant problems of development financing are those concerning funding of communication projects. The UNESCO debate over the free flow of information of the 1970's resulted in a new office for the agency, the IPDC mentioned earlier. This office was supposed to be the mechanism for much of the conscience money for First World nations who had succeeded in softening some of the harsh language of certain new information order resolutions at various UNESCO meetings. But after the initial public meeting of IPDC supporters in Acapulco last year, it became apparent that few countries of the First World were going to put significant amounts of money into projects that had been defined by Third World countries themselves. For example, after many protestations of concern by the First World over the real problems of communication in the Third World, the total amount collected to date (May 1983) has been under $4 million. Clearly these are amounts that do not begin

to solve serious lacks in information and communication technology in the the Third World.

There has been concern expressed by various academic groups that government domestic cutbacks for communication research, in addition to those in the international sphere, would reduce sponsored research and do serious damage to the profession. However, such cutbacks might provide greater stimulus to academics to ask a variety of questions that the communication research profession may not have been used to asking in times of greater sponsored research.[29]

As a final observation about funding, we might reflect what influence communication scholars might have in redirecting funds to those groups where our ethical reflection suggests they would have the greatest impact on human needs. As we suggested above, the work of genuine grass roots organizations might provide the best basis for the "democratization of communication" that the MacBride Commission called for. I recall one country in Latin America where 3 private radio stations (in three local languages and reaching significant local audiences) had a total combined yearly budget of $35,000. The government at the time was trying to create an almost parallel system with an annual budget of about $350,000. The government project never really got off the ground after a number of years of trying, but probably over $1 million was spent on the effort. I have often thought how far that same amount of money would have gone for the three local stations that are still operating. But I also know that the perception of the government was that the local, private groups were "stirring up trouble" and today, a decade later, that area is a scene of heavy counterinsurgency sweeps by a well equipped army. It is no easy thing to promote social change at the grass roots because it often may entail threats to a status quo that has been built on centuries of injustice. Yet there are other less extreme cases, where we may in our writing and

speaking direct attention of policy makers and funders to those sectors of real opportunity for growth and change. Ultimately, each of us has to take that personal path that is suggested after we have made the necessary critical reflection on ends and means that development ethics entails.

Notes

1. J. Mayo, R. Hornik & E. Mc Anany, Educational Reform with Television: The Case of El Salvador. Stanford: Standford University Press, 1976.

2. Private communication with Dr. David Beckman of the World Bank.

3. For a review of communication's role in the Islamic revolution, see, for example, A. Srenberny-Mohammadi, "Communications and Revolution in Iran," Paper prepared for the World Communication Conference, Annenberg School of Communication, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA, May, 1980; for a review of several works on the Church's role in Latin American politics, see D. Levine, "Religion, Society and Politics: State of the Art," Latin American Research Review, 16, 3, 1981.

4. For the classic view of modernization: D. Lerner, The Passing of Traditional Society. New York: The Free Press, 1958; A. Inkles & D. Smith, Becoming Modern. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974. For views contesting the limiting views of traditional values, see E. Shils, Tradition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982; M. Tehranian, - "Iran: Communication, Alienation, Revolution" Intermedia 7, 2 (1979).

5. A review of Latin American Studies over the past decade attests to this popularity. See J. Tulchin, "Emerging Patterns of Research in the Study of Latin America," Latin American Research Review, 18, 1, Spring, 1983.

6. For a distinction between imperialism and dependency see I. Sarti, "Communication and Cultural Dependency: A Misconception" in E. Mc Anany, J. Schnitman & N. Janus (eds) Communication and Social Structure: Critical Studies in Mass Media Research, New York: Praeger Publications, 1981.

7. F. Fanon, The Wretched of the Earth. New York: Grove Press, 1965; P. Freire, The Pedagogy of the Oppressed. New York: Herder, 1971.

8. There have been a number of reviews of both the classics of the old paradigm and the heralding of the new. For the old, three classics will do: Lerner, Op. Cit., W. Schramm, Mass Media and National Development. Stanford University Press, 1964. E. Rogers & Shoemaker, The Communication of Innovations. New York: Free Press, 1971. N.B. There is a new edition of the diffusion work by Rogers in 1983.

9. For the best of many critiques, one can turn to several summary chapters and books now in circulation, but some early harbinger were: P. Golding, "Media Role in National Development: Critique of a Theoretical Orthodoxy", Journal of Communications. 24, 1, 1974; J. Grunig, "Communication and Economic Decision-Making of Columbian Peasants", Economic Development and Cultural Change, 19, 2, 1971; H. Felstehausen, "Conceptual Limits of Development Communication Theory", Rural Sociology, 38, 3, 1973; Two books reviewing this criticism are E. Rogers (ed) Development Communication: Critical Perspectives, Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1976; E. Mc Anany (ed) Communication in the Rural Third World: The Role of Information in Development. New York: Praeger Publications, 1980. See also E. Mc Anany, "From Modernization and Diffusion to Dependency and Beyond: Theory and Practice in Communication for Social Change in the 1980's" Keynote address for

Midwest Regional Symposium on Development Communications for the Third World. University of Illinois, Urbana-Campaign, April, 1983.

10. UNESCO, Mac Bride Commission Report, Many Voices, One World, New York: Unipublications, 1980; M. Jussawalla and B. Hughes, "The Information Economy and Indigenous Communication," in Wang and Disayanake (ed) Continuity and Change in Asian Communication Systems. (Ablex, in press).

11. IPDC report, Unesco, Intergovernmental. Council of the International Program for Development Communication Final Report. Paris: Unesco, April 1982.

12. E. Contreras," Brazil and Guatemala: Communications, Rural Modernity and Structural Constraints" in E. Mc Anany (ed) op.cit. (1980).

13. R. Hornik, "Communication as Complement", Journal of Communication, 30,3, 1980.

14. Much of the work published at ILET (Instituto Latinoamericano de Estudios Transnationales) in Mexico City from 1977 to 1982 argues in this direction. Also, see E. Mc Anany, "The Logic of Cultural Industries in Latin America: The Television Industry in Brazil" in Mosco and Wasko (eds) Critical Communciation Review, Vol 2, (Ablex: in press).

15. S. Hall, "Cultural Studies: Two Paradigms" Media, Culture and Society, 2, 1, 1980.

16. K. Singh & B. Gross, "Alternative Communication Strategies in Third World Countries",Economic and Political Weekly, 16, 8, 1981.

17. Center on Transnational Corporations, United Nations, "Transborder Data Flows and the Brazil Government: A Case Study", New York: CTC, 1983.

18. H. Schiller, Who Knows: Information in the Age of the Fortune 500, Norwood: Ablex Publications, 1981; D. Schiller, Telematics and Government, Norwood: Ablex Publications, 1982; J. R. Schement, L. Lievrow and H. Dordick, "The Information Society in California: Social Factors Influencing its Emergence" Telecommunications Policy, March, 1983; J. Rada, "The Micro-electronics Revolution: Implications for the Third World" Development Dialogue, 2, 1981.

19. E. Wolf, Peasant Wars in the Twentieth Century. New York: Harper and Row, 1970; B. Moore, Injustice: The Social Basis of Obedience and Revolt. New York: Pantheon, 1979.

20. E. Wolf, op. cit., 1970.

21. M. Tehranian, "The Curse of Modernity", Mimeo, 1980.

22. D. Levine, op. cit., 1981; P. Lernoux, Cry of the People. New York: Doubleday and Company, 1980; National Catholic Reporter, May, 1983.

23. G. Esteva, "Food, Self Reliance, and Peasant Self-Management: Basis for the Agrarian Transformation of Mexico", Mimeo, Institute of Latin American Studies, University of Texas, Austin, Texas, March, 1983.

24. A. De Janvry, The Agrarian Question and Reformism in Latin America. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1981.

25. T. Bruneau, The Church in Brazil: The Politics of Reform. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1982; P. Lernoux, op. cit., 1980; G. Gutierrez, A Theology of Liberation: History, Politics and Salvation. New York: Orbis Books. 1973.

26. D. Goulet, Survival with Integrity: Sarvodya at the Crossroads. Colombo, Sri Lanka: Marga Institute, 1981.

27. D. Goulet, "Beyond Moralism: Ethical Strategies in Moral Development" in T. Mc Fadden (ed) Theology Confronts a Changing World. West Mystic Conneticut: Twentythird Publications, 1977.

28. International Development Association, 1982. IDA in Retrospect: The First Two Decades of the International Development Association. New York: Oxford University Press (for the World Bank); R. Sivard, World Military and Social Expenditure. Leesburg Virginia: World Priorities, 1981.

29. J. Halloran, "The Context of Mass Communication Research", in E. Mc Anany, J. Schnitman & N. Janus (eds) op. cit., 1981.